



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



THOMAS D. WATKINS, JR.
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Revised 4.1.03

MEMORANDUM

To: Institutions of Higher Education

From: Cheryl L. Poole

Date: March 28, 2003

Subject: Title II, Part A(3), Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program

For 2003-2004, the Michigan Department of Education is authorized to award approximately \$3.6 million in the Title II, Part A (3) Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program. Grants are awarded for *approximately a 24 month* period with an expected announcement date in July 2003.

The focus of this RFP is to provide research-based professional development to teachers, principals and highly qualified paraprofessionals to result in increased student learning. These grants are available to departments of teacher preparation in partnership with departments of arts and sciences and high need LEAs. Please pay special attention to the priorities and funding criteria in the application package.

Attached are the Guidelines and Instructions for the 2003-2004 Title II, Part A(3) funding cycle.

Purpose: To support partnerships in the provision of professional development needed to achieve the goal of having a highly qualified teacher in every classroom by the academic year 2005-2006.

Deadline for Submission of Application: 4:00 p.m., May 28, 2003

Application Available: March 28, 2003

Available Funds: \$3.6 million

Estimated Range of Awards: Up to \$200,000

Estimated Number of Awards: 20-24

Project Period: Date of approval (anticipated to be July, 2003) through June 30, 2004 for a portion of the award and June 30, 2005 for another portion of the award.

Budget Period: 12-24 Months

Guidelines and Instructions for Title II, Part A(3) – Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program

The State Board of Education has adopted as its Strategic Goal, “Attain substantial and meaningful improvement in academic achievement for all students, with primary emphasis on chronically under performing schools and students.” In addition, the State Board has adopted the following five Strategic Initiatives and adopted policy recommendations in each area to implement the goal:

Ensuring Excellent Educators
Elevating Educational Leadership
Embracing the Information Age
Ensuring Early Childhood Literacy
Integrating Communities and Schools

To the extent possible, all grant criteria and grant awards will include priority consideration of the Strategic Goal and the Strategic Initiatives.

BACKGROUND/PURPOSE OF GRANT

☒ Competitive ☐ Formula ☒ New ☐ Continuation

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 authorizes a new teacher and principal professional development competitive grant program delimited within Title II, Part A, of the legislation. The competitive grants program supports the formation of partnerships between high-need local education agencies (LEAs), defined in Section 2101(3) of the Act, colleges or departments of teacher education, and colleges or departments of arts and sciences. The program is intended to provide grant awards to support teacher and principal professional development in the core academic subjects. It is the intent of this program to coordinate professional development needed to achieve the goal of having a highly qualified teacher in every classroom by the academic year 2005-2006.

TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE

For fiscal year 2003-2004, there is approximately \$3.6 million available to fund competitive grant awards to support teacher and principal professional development. The Office of Professional Preparation Services proposes to manage a competitive process for the awarding of grants from the available funds.

LEGISLATION

President Bush signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, into law on January 8, 2002. The legislation focuses on improving student achievement for all students, especially children in the nation’s most disadvantaged schools and communities. Title II, Part A, authorizes the Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grant Program for establishing partnerships between high-need local education agencies, colleges or departments of teacher education, and colleges or departments of arts and sciences to provide professional development to teachers and principals.

RATIONALE FOR CRITERIA/STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION PRIORITIES

The Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grant Program further assists the State Board of Education with the goal of prioritizing service to low-performing schools. The program addresses the Strategic Initiatives of Ensuring Excellent Educators because priority is given to applicants that propose partnerships between high-need local education agencies and institutions of higher education.

CRITERIA

☒ Defined in Legislation ☐ Defined in Department's Grant ☐ Proposed by Staff

Consistent with the priorities and criteria it has announced for selection of grant recipients, including priority consideration to grants that implement particular recommendations of the State Board's Ensuring Excellent Educators Task Force and its Board-adopted policy recommendations (Attachment A), the MDE must make awards of *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Program* funds to support the following types of partnership activities to enhance student achievement in participating high-need LEAs:

Professional development activities in core academic subjects to ensure that:

- Teachers and highly qualified paraprofessionals (and, when appropriate, principals) have subject matter knowledge in the academic subjects that the teachers teach (including knowledge of how to use computers and other technology to enhance student learning consistent with Standard 7 of the Entry-Level Standards for Michigan Teachers, as well as the recommendations of the State Board of Education Task Force on Embracing the Information Age); and
- Principals have the instructional leadership skills to help them work more effectively with teachers to help students master core academic subjects consistent with the recommendations of the State Board of Education Task Force on Elevating Educational Leadership.
- Development and provision of assistance to LEAs and to their teachers, highly qualified paraprofessionals, or school principals, in providing sustained, high-quality professional development activities that:
- Ensure that those individuals can use challenging State academic content standards, student academic achievement standards, and State assessments to improve instructional practices and student academic achievement;
- May include intensive programs designed to prepare individuals to provide instruction related to the professional development described in the preceding paragraph to others in their schools; and
- May include activities of partnerships between one or more LEA, one or more of the LEA's schools, and one or more institutions of higher education (IHE) for the purpose of improving teaching and learning at low-performing schools.

Eligibility is limited to partnerships comprised at a minimum of (1) a private or public IHE and the division of the institution that prepares teachers and principals; (2) a school of arts and sciences; and (3) a high-need LEA (see below).

An eligible partnership may also include another LEA, a public charter school, an elementary school or secondary school, an educational service agency, a nonprofit educational organization, another IHE, a school of arts and sciences within that IHE, the division of that IHE that prepares teachers and principals, a nonprofit cultural organization, an entity carrying out a pre-kindergarten program, a teacher organization, a principal organization, or a business.

A high-need LEA is defined as an LEA:

- (i) That serves not fewer than 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line; or
- (ii) For which not less than 20 percent of the children served by the agency are from families with incomes below the poverty line; and
- (i) For which there is a high percentage of teachers not teaching in the academic subjects or grade levels that the teachers were trained to teach; or
- (ii) For which there is a high percentage of teachers with emergency, provisional, or temporary certification or licensing.

See December 19th Non-Regulatory Draft Guidance for Title II, Part A on the U.S. Department of Education's website at www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/AIDP/epdp.html#guidance. (Click on Guidance at top of page under title).

In accordance with the federal law, No Child Left Behind, (absolute) priority will be given to those proposals forming partnerships that include high-need LEAs. Furthermore, in recognition of the importance of the State Board of Education's commitment to ensure quality teachers in chronically under performing schools and students; partnerships may only include and serve the lowest performing schools (those rated "unaccredited" or "D/Alert" under Education Yes!), as long as these LEAs are also eligible under the federal High Need LEA definition.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

All applications for a grant award must be made by institutions of higher education. An institution of higher education must serve as the fiscal agent for the project.

OFFICE ADMINISTERING GRANT

Office of Professional Preparation Services

PROGRAM ADMINISTERING GRANT

Program Approval and Continuing Education Unit

PROGRAM CONTACT

Cheryl L. Poole at (517) 241-4546 or PooleCL@michigan.gov.

**2003-2004 NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT, TITLE II:
IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM**

TITLE II OF P.L. 107-110

State Grants to Strengthen Skills of Teachers and Instruction in the Core Academic Curriculum

FEDERAL CFDA Number 84.367B

PART I - GENERAL INFORMATION AND PROGRAM GUIDELINES

The enclosed materials provide application information to enable public and independent higher education institutions (IHEs) to participate in the Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program. A teacher preparation institution may apply for funding on behalf of a proposed partnership, which involves high-need local educational agencies, and a college/Department of Arts and Sciences. The purpose of the program is to support the development and implementation of sustained and intensive high-quality professional development activities to better enable new and experienced teachers, as well as building administrators, to help all students meet challenging standards in the core academic subjects.

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) anticipates receiving approximately \$2.7 for grants to be awarded by the State Board of Education under the No Child Left Behind Act, Title II, Part A(3) Competitive Grant Program. These funds in addition to approximately \$926, 685 in carryover from 2002-2003 will be awarded for the following purposes.

Consistent with the priorities and criteria it has announced for selection of grant recipients, the MDE must make awards of *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants* funds to support the following types of partnership activities to enhance student achievement in participating high-need Local Education Agencies (LEAs):

1. Professional development activities in core academic subjects to ensure that:

- Teachers and highly qualified paraprofessionals (and, when appropriate, principals) have subject matter knowledge in the academic subjects that the teachers teach (including knowledge of how to use computers and other technology to enhance student learning consistent with Standard 7 of the Entry-Level Standards for Michigan Teachers, as well as the recommendations of the State Board of Education Task Force on Embracing the Information Age); and
- Principals have the instructional leadership skills to help them work more effectively with teachers to help students master core academic subjects consistent with the recommendations of the State Board of Education Task Force on Elevating Educational Leadership.

2. Development and provision of assistance to LEAs and to their teachers, highly qualified paraprofessionals, or school principals, in providing sustained, high-quality professional development activities that:

- Ensure that those individuals can use challenging State academic content standards, student academic achievement standards, and State assessments to improve instructional practices and student academic achievement;

- May include intensive programs designed to prepare individuals to provide instruction related to the professional development described in the preceding paragraph to others in their schools; and
- May include activities of partnerships between one or more LEA, one or more of the LEA schools, and one or more IHE for the purpose of improving teaching and learning at low-performing schools.

A. GRANT CATEGORIES

Funding will be awarded in following grant categories:

a. Partnerships for Professional Development in Mathematics:

Projects forming partnerships for the improvement of educator content knowledge in mathematics, appropriate teaching methodology for mathematics and the improvement of the educator's ability to collect and assess evidence of the use of content knowledge and instructional skills to increase student learning. Projects must focus on individual educator needs to improve student achievement in mathematics and be able to demonstrate progress in meeting federal and state goals for all students. Projects are expected to incorporate Michigan Department of Education resources for the teaching of mathematics, including the Michigan Curriculum Framework, the MiCLIMB clarifying document and the grade level expectations for students, as an integral part of the professional development.

b. Partnerships for Professional Development in Science:

Projects forming partnerships for the improvement of educator content knowledge in science, appropriate teaching methodology for science and the improvement of the educator's ability to collect and assess evidence of the use of content knowledge and instructional skills to increase student learning. Projects must focus on individual educator needs to improve student achievement in science and be able to demonstrate progress in meeting federal and state goals for all students. Projects are expected to incorporate Michigan Department of Education resources for the teaching of science, including the Michigan Curriculum Framework, the Michigan Clarifying Language in Michigan Benchmarks MiCLIMB clarifying document and the grade level expectations for students, as an integral part of the professional development.

c. Partnerships for Professional Development in Social Studies:

Projects forming partnerships for the improvement of educator content knowledge in social studies, appropriate teaching methodology for social studies and the improvement of the educator's ability to collect and assess evidence of the use of content knowledge and instructional skills to increase student learning. Projects must focus on individual educator needs to improve student achievement in social studies and be able to demonstrate progress in meeting federal and state goals for all students. Projects must focus on district needs to improve student achievement in the social studies and be able to demonstrate progress in meeting federal and state goals for all students. Projects are expected to incorporate Michigan Department of Education resources for the teaching of the social studies, including the Michigan Curriculum Framework, the MiCLIMB clarifying document and the grade level expectations for students, as an integral part of the professional development.

d. Partnership for Professional Development in One or More of the Arts Disciplines:

Projects forming partnerships for the improvement of educator content knowledge in the Arts, appropriate teaching methodology and the improvement of the educator's ability to collect and assess evidence of the

use of content knowledge and instructional skills to increase student learning. Projects must focus on individual educator needs to improve student achievement in the Arts and be able to demonstrate progress in meeting federal and state goals for all students. Projects are expected to incorporate Michigan Department of Education resources for the teaching of the arts, including the Michigan Curriculum Framework, the MiCLIMB clarifying document and the grade level expectations as an integral part of the professional development.

e. *Professional Development to Sustain and Deepen Prior Learning*

Projects forming partnerships to continue and deepen learning of a recent prior project. Projects must directly engage former participants through reflective inquiry, assess application of new content and methodology and apply professional judgment to alter instruction to increase student learning.

B. DISTRIBUTION OF GRANT FUNDS

An approximate allocation of \$2.7 million is anticipated as an award to Michigan in July 2003. This amount plus \$926,685 in carryover funds from 2002-2003 will be awarded in competitive grants as described above. Grant awards will be made for up to \$200,000 for a project. It is anticipated that 20-24 awards will be made.

If the allocated amount of funds for any category is not awarded, then the remaining funds will be used to support projects in other categories.

In compliance with federal guidelines, 100% of the total grant allocation will be awarded for projects in the core academic subjects.

C. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

- Any one of the 32 colleges or universities approved by the State Board of Education to prepare teachers and principals forming a partnership comprised of one or more high need LEA. **(The fiscal agent for the grant must be a higher education institution.)**

Eligibility is limited to partnerships comprised at a minimum of (1) a private or public IHE and the division of the institution that prepares teachers and principals; (2) a school of arts and sciences; and (3) a high-need LEA (see below).

An eligible partnership may also include another LEA, a public charter school, an elementary school or secondary school, an educational service agency, a nonprofit educational organization, another IHE, a school of arts and sciences within that IHE, the division of that IHE that prepares teachers and principals, a nonprofit cultural organization, an entity carrying out a pre-kindergarten program, a teacher organization, a principal organization, or a business.

- A high-need LEA is defined as an LEA:
 - (i) That serves not fewer than 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line; or
 - (ii) For which not less than 20 percent of the children served by the agency are from families with incomes below the poverty line; and

- (i) For which there is a high percentage of teachers not teaching in the academic subjects or grade levels that the teachers were trained to teach; or
 - (ii) For which there is a high percentage of teachers with emergency, provisional, or temporary certification or licensing.
- A nonprofit organization (NPO) which has, as its primary purpose, the improvement of student learning in mathematics, science, reading or other core academic subjects, and can document the provision of effective teacher training programs.

Each NPO applicant must provide written evidence of:

1. Past demonstrated effectiveness in providing professional development for teachers in mathematics, science, reading or other core academic subjects. Documentation should include: title, dates and location of activities; number of teachers who participated; names and titles of instructional personnel; a summary of course/workshop content and activities (syllabus); and evidence of project outcomes which may include data on improved student outcomes, the final evaluation report, recruitment procedures, and resulting materials or publications.
2. Financial Stability. Documentation must include: a complete copy of the management letter from the most recent independently audited financial statement, evidence that the NPO is not dependent on this grant for continued existence of the organization, its current staff configuration; and evidence of official registration with the Michigan Department of Treasury as a 501(c) nonprofit organization whose main office is located in Michigan.

D. APPLICATION PROCEDURES

Institutions/organizations interested in applying for a No Child Left Behind Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grant must submit a completed application packet, including all required components.

The deadline for submission of an application is ***May 28, 2003, by 4:00 p.m.***

It is anticipated that grant awards will be submitted for approval to the State Board of Education in July 2003 State Board Meeting.

E. REQUIRED COMPONENTS

All projects recommended for funding must:

- Be clearly aligned with Michigan's Curriculum Framework standards for content, teaching and learning, assessment and professional development;
- Be collaboratively planned by including representatives of the population targeted to be served by the project. These should include local public and nonpublic school teachers and administrators, public and independent college/university faculty (including representatives of the education and arts and sciences units), relevant professional organizations, informal education entities (museums, libraries, etc.) and Michigan Department of Education curriculum staff (*see Form IVb, Verification of Collaborative Planning*);

(Public and nonpublic schools are encouraged to survey and critically evaluate their professional development needs and status in core academic subjects, and to initiate contact with their colleagues at higher education institutions to work in partnership providing the professional development they identify.)

- *Indicate clear, substantive evidence (including but not limited to quantitative data) about student and educator learning needs upon which this proposal is based.*
- *Identify the current, scientifically-based research on which the proposed professional development is founded or, at a minimum, cites innovative professional development and related theory and research on which the proposed professional development can reasonably build;*
- Address the continuum of teacher development, including pre-service, novice and mastery levels and;
- Use various technologies for project implementation in support of teacher professional development and for the advancement of teacher technology competence.

F. SELECTION OF AWARD RECIPIENTS

Grants will be awarded through a competitive review process. The review and scoring of each application will be based on criteria that supports sustained and intensive high-quality professional development programs, designed to improve content knowledge and teaching skills in the core academic subjects for elementary and secondary teachers and other members of the instructional team.

Grant applications will be reviewed using a two-step process, including an external and internal panel of experts. Because the number and type of applications received always exceeds the level of available funding, an external panel will be used to review all eligible applications submitted.

Using a numerical scoring system, this process is intended to identify the most impressive applications for which funding should be considered. *See Appendix B for the scoring rubric.*

These applications are then reviewed by an internal panel of Michigan Department of Education curriculum consultants, with the intent of coordinating funding and other initiatives to better meet the learning needs of students across the state.

The number of grants recommended for awards will be limited to the availability of funds, the quality of proposals submitted, and the size of the final budget negotiated for each project.

G. FUNDING PRIORITIES

Priority will be given to projects that:

- Include or address the building of local capacity to sustain the initiative at the conclusion of the grant period.
- Use proven strategies that result in improved student performance and those based on scientific research, will be given priority.
- Priority will be given to projects that directly serve schools most needing assistance as defined by those not meeting AYP or by Education YES!

H. FINAL REPORT

The final report for a project funded in this category must include, at a minimum, the following information.

- *The amount of funds under the grant or subgrant;*
- *How the grantee or subgrantee used the funds;*
- *The total cost of project activities;*
- *The share of the cost provided from other sources; and*
- *Other records to facilitate an effective audit.*
- *Records of participating educators, evidence of classroom impact, or at a minimum, evidence of change of practice.*

I. WHERE TO OBTAIN HELP

The instructions contained in these materials are issued by the Michigan Department of Education, which is the sole point of contact in the state for this program. Questions regarding applications should be directed to Cheryl L. Poole, Office of Professional Preparation Services, Michigan Department of Education, P.O. Box 30008, Lansing, Michigan 48909; telephone: (517) 241-4546; email:

PooleCL@michigan.gov.

PART II – REVIEW CRITERIA

REVIEW PROCESS

All applications will be reviewed and rated by staff of the Department of Education and university and K-12 representatives from the field having content and program administration expertise. Proposals are required to address all the identified criteria. **Proposals that exceed the allowed number of pages will be assessed a penalty of five (5) points for each page beyond the specified page limits. Additional documents and materials, such as videotapes, will not be reviewed.**

REVIEW CRITERIA

All applications will be evaluated on the basis of the criteria described hereafter. The narrative portion of applications should address the criteria. The maximum possible number of points for all of the criteria is 100, and the value assigned for each criterion follows:

DEMONSTRATED NEED AND SIGNIFICANCE OF PROJECT (10 POINTS)

Proposals should represent a constructive and potentially productive approach to a significant need facing Michigan teachers. The reviewers will look for:

- a. The presence of strong evidence about student and educator learning needs upon which the choice of professional development is based;
- b. A description of the actions taken previously by the applicant(s) and/or other entities to address the need, if applicable; and
- c. *The partnership includes at least one of the schools most in need of assistance as defined by Education Yes!*
- d. *For Category E, clear summative evidence of learning at the conclusion of a recent prior project.*

PLAN OF OPERATION (45 POINTS)

A review of each application will be made to determine the thoroughness of the plan of operation. In making this determination, the reviewers will look for:

- a. *Identification of the current, scientifically-based research on which the proposed professional development is founded or, at a minimum, cites innovative professional development and related theory and research on which the proposed professional development can reasonably build;*
- b. A clear statement of the short-term and long-term goals of the project, the expected results and how attainment will be measured;
- c. A clearly described implementation plan that addressed **all the required components**;
- d. A description or graphic representation of the conceptual model of teaching and learning on which the proposal is based. Appropriate literature references and examples of implementation of the model as related to the identified needs, must be provided to support the rationale for selection of that particular model;

- e. A plan to encourage/ensure that instructors/instructional faculty will model appropriate teaching behaviors and methods;
- f. An activity plan, including proposed objectives, key activities to accomplish the objectives with benchmarks to determine progress toward objectives; a time line; and a plan for disseminating information about project outcomes;
- g. A plan for effective administration of the project identifying responsibilities of project staff; and
- h. A plan to continue to involve appropriate groups in the project, including, but not limited to, local boards, as well as teachers and administrators, mathematics, science and/or other resource centers, public museums, libraries, and business and industry.

EVALUATION PLAN (15 POINTS)

Review of applications will be based on the extent to which proposals:

Articulate clear and precise objectives, indicators and evaluation activities (data collection, analysis, and reporting methods; expected time line; and responsibilities for the activities).

- a. Although the evaluation plan must include the collection of data about the numbers and the characteristics of project participants (and the affected students), the more important part of the evaluation will be to determine the effects of the program on teachers and, as appropriate, their students. Emphasis should be placed on determining changes in teaching practices (i.e., the use of appropriate/effective materials/equipment/facilities and teaching/learning/assessment strategies that lead to improved student accomplishment in mathematics, science, or other core academic subjects). Attention must also be given to determining progress toward accomplishment of objectives related to professional development and systemic reform;
- b. *Set aside a minimum of 5% of the budget for an independent evaluation and report of the project.*
- c. The evaluation plan should include efforts to directly collect data in follow-up classroom observations of a credible and appropriate sample of the teachers and other personnel served by the project; and
- d. Grant recipients must agree to participate in the statewide evaluation of funded programs including follow-up observations of project participants.

UNDERREPRESENTED STUDENT ACCESS (5 POINTS)

Each application will be reviewed to determine the extent to which:

- a. The instructional design addresses the learning needs of all students and motivates, supports and encourages underrepresented student achievement; and
- b. Activities are **specified** to address and reduce the effect of teachers' low expectations of and negative attitudes toward culturally different students.

BUDGET AND COST EFFECTIVENESS

Each application will be reviewed to determine the extent to which:

- a. The budget is cost effective, adequate to support the proposed project only, and complies with the budget requirements of the REP;
- b. There is evidence of a clear relationship between budget items, project objectives and anticipated results;
- c. Adherence to allowable costs; i.e., indirect cost of no more than 8%, consultant fees limited to no more than \$800/day, participant stipends limited to \$200/day, no purchase of classroom instructional materials (limited to only what is needed to conduct the professional development), or stipend, and no purchase of nonexpendable supplies;
- d. All expenditures are identified as to which partner directly benefits.

Participant stipends are designed for tuition, fees, books, materials, travel and/or other expenses.

Tuition charges are not eligible for direct funding. No state or subgrantee may count tuition and fees collected from students toward meeting matching, cost sharing or maintenance of effort requirements of a program. (EDGAR, Section 76.534)

Unallowable Costs: Costs of entertainment, including amusement, diversion, and social activities and any costs directly associated with such costs (such as tickets to shows or sports events, meal, lodging, rentals, transportation, and gratuities) are unallowable. Costs of alcoholic beverages are unallowable.

SPECIAL RULE Section 2132(c): The legislation requires that no single participant in an eligible partnership receiving a grant in this program may use more than 50% of the grant funds. For example, each of three partner entities (education, arts and sciences and a high-need school) may share 1/3 of the total grant equally, or may use 50% of the grant with the other two sharing 25% each, etc., but none may use more than 50% of the total grant.

Note: Neither capital nor nonexpendable supply expenditures are allowed.

F. QUALIFICATIONS OF KEY PERSONNEL (5 POINTS)

A review of each application will be made to determine whether the qualifications of key personnel are appropriate. In making this determination, the reviewers will look for:

- a. The qualifications of the project director and other key personnel to be used in the project;
- b. The percentage of time each of the above persons will commit to the project; and
- c. The extent to which the applicant will give preference to groups that have been traditionally underrepresented, such as handicapped persons, women, the elderly, and members of racial or ethnic minority groups.
- d. Qualifications may be demonstrated by a resume or biographical sketch of the

person who will fill the position, or by a statement of required experience and education and recruitment plan for individuals to be hired by the project.

G. APPLICANT'S COMMITMENT AND CAPACITY (5 POINTS)

Each application will be reviewed for information that shows the applicant is committed to and capable of the successful implementation and continuation of the project. In making this determination, consideration will be given to:

- a. Whether the applicant is demonstrably essential to the achievement of objectives, the project's integrity, and may be approved where there is verifiable need;
- b. A statement of the institution's capacity and likelihood to continue the project when federal assistance ends; and
- c. A plan to identify and secure funding sources for program continuation.

H. SUMMARY (5 POINTS)

A review of each application will be made to determine the likelihood of success for professional development experiences by reviewing of quality indicators for the proposal. In addition, the reviewers will look for information that shows:

- a. The extent to which the project will contribute to the achievement of national and state goals for students based on the state's needs and priorities; and
- b. The extent to which the project could serve as a model for replication and/or statewide dissemination.

ADDITIONAL REVIEW FACTORS

In addition to the criteria listed above, the State Board of Education may apply other factors in making decisions to fund proposals such as evidence that a) the applicant has performed satisfactorily on previous projects, b) the funding of the project will not result in duplication of effort, and c) the project will serve specific geographic areas and will facilitate the state in meeting the overall professional development, curriculum improvement, and teacher education goals.

PART III – APPLICATION AND INSTRUCTIONS

LENGTH OF PROPOSALS

Proposal narratives are to be no longer than 20 pages including charts and graphs. Appendices may be attached to each proposal, but reviewers are not required to read these in detail. Appendices are not to exceed 15 pages. Proposals are to be presented unbound, without special covers or organizational inserts. Proposals are required to address all of the identified criteria . **Proposals that exceed the allowed number of pages will be assessed a penalty of five (5) points for each page beyond the specified page limit. Additional documents and materials, such as videotapes, will not be reviewed.**

Proposals are required to be double-spaced using no less than eleven (11) font size and no less than 1 inch margins. Proposals using less than eleven (11) font size will be assigned a penalty of twenty (20) points.

CLOSING DATE AND DELIVERY ADDRESS

The original of the application along with 4 copies must be received at the address below by 4:00 p.m on May 28, 2003, or postmarked by May 26, 2003 if mailed. Late applicants will be notified that their applications will not be considered. Inquiries and applications should be addressed to:

**Michigan Department of Education
Office of Professional Preparation Services
2nd Floor
608 West Allegan
Lansing, MI 48933
Attention: Cheryl L. Poole**

Applications may be hand-delivered to the 1st Floor Security Desk of the John Hannah Building, 608 West Allegan, Lansing, Michigan.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE MEETING

A pre-proposal meeting will be held on March 28, 2003. Topics will include:

1. Michigan's share of the federal funding for Title II Part A(3) and the federal priorities for its uses.
2. The focus on professional development that serves the outcome of increased student learning.
3. The emphasis on high need schools, active partnerships and professional development standards.
4. The US Department of Education's definition of research-based professional development.
5. The MDE categories for priorities in funding and the application process.
6. The rubric for developing and evaluating applications.

The pre-proposal meeting will be held:

Date: March 28, 2003

Time: 9:30 a.m.-3:30 p.m.

**Place: Ingham Intermediate School District
2630 West Howell Road
Mason, MI**

Lunch will be served.

IHE's that intend to submit an application for this cycle of funding are strongly encouraged to send at least one but not more than two representatives to this session who will be involved in developing the application to attend this meeting to learn the specifics of different emphases that have been introduced into this RFP. Applications that do not address these emphases will not be funded.

Please confirm with Elizabeth Mason the attendance of all individuals who intend to attend the March 28th session by email at MasonE@michigan.gov or by telephone 517-241-4945 no later than Thursday, March 20, 2003. Please be sure that you receive an email response to verify your RSVP.

Persons with disabilities needing accommodations for participation in this function are invited to contact the Department of Education to request mobility, visual, hearing or other assistance. Please contact Elizabeth Mason at (517) 241-4945 or by e-mail at MasonE@michigan.gov.

COMPLETING THE APPLICATION

A separate application must be completed for each proposal submitted. Applicants for all grants are required to use the following instructions for completing the application form.

Section I – APPLICANT/INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

Educational Agency: Name of higher education institution, president, code number and mailing address.

Contact Person: Name, address, telephone number and email address of person to be contacted for information regarding the application and/or program.

Project Director: Name, address, telephone number and email address of person who will be directly responsible for implementing the grant program.

Section II – PROJECT INFORMATION

Grant Category: Check primary funding category.

Curriculum Area: Check primary descriptive category.

Participating Agencies: Check all that apply. (See forms IVa and IVb.)

Section III – Pages 1a and 1b - ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS

Provide appropriate documentation as requested. Pages 1a and 1b of the application contain the assurances of compliance with state and federal legislation. The authorized official must sign the certification on both the cover page and page 1b. The original form must have an original signature, a date, and the typed name of the authorized official on the bottom of the cover page of the application. Applicants must provide a copy of the letter inviting the participation of nonpublic schools within their service area, along with a list of those schools. **Note: Signatures for assurances required on front cover and page 1b.**

Section IV a – Page 2a - DESIGNATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE/FISCAL AGENT AND VERIFICATION OF COLLABORATIVE/CONSORTIUM PARTICIPANTS

Use this page for all partners that are participating in proposed collaborative/consortium projects, or to verify local involvement of all high-need local school districts or agencies. Original signatures of authorized officials are required on the original application form copy.

Section IV b – Pages 2b and 2c – VERIFICATION OF COLLABORATIVE PLANNING (all applicants)

In the spaces provided, identify the planned meeting(s) for the stakeholders and representatives of relevant organizations. **Attach a copy of the agenda and list of participants for the Initial Proposal Planning Meeting(s).**

Section V a-c – Pages 3a-g - BUDGET

Complete the Budget Summary and Budget Detail sheets for both FY 2003 and 2004. A portion of each award may be 2003 carryover funds needing to be spent by June 30, 2004. Please indicate which project expenses could be expended by June 20, 2005.

Describe stipends, materials and/or gifts that would be given to participants.

Projects that receive financial or other contributions from the local education agency (LEA) partner and others must include a statement confirming that contribution in the formal agreement endorsed by the LEA on Section V c: *Declaration of Previous and Current Funding for Related Projects* form. Additional copies of this form should be duplicated as needed.

Section VI- Page 4 – ABSTRACT

Prepare a *200-word* description of this project. Complete this section after completing the entire application, using the sheet provided. The abstract will be used when a description of your project is included in public documents. It is recommended that a concept map be included that graphically represents the project. Abstract, including concept map, is not to exceed two (2) pages. **(Note: This information will be disseminated as written.)**

Section VII – Narrative

Prepare a concise and clearly written narrative statement of not more than twenty (20) pages for initial projects, including charts and graphs, that address the Review Criteria listed (See Review Criteria on pages 11-15 of this document.) These criteria will be used by the review panelists to assess each application.

- Demonstrated Need and Significance of Project including evidence indicating need on part of both student and teacher for the proposed professional development.
- Plan of Operation including the research base verifying the effectiveness of the proposed professional development.
- Evaluation Plan
- Underrepresented Student Access
- Budget and Cost Effectiveness
- Qualifications of Key Personnel
- Applicant's Commitment and Capacity
- Summary

FINAL PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND REVIEW PROCESS

All final proposals must be submitted by a higher education institution, which also serves as the fiscal agent. There is no limit placed on the number of proposals an institution may submit. **Each individual project director may submit no more than one proposal per grant year.**

Failure to complete all required forms and/or to provide appropriate and official institutional signatures by the application deadline will result in non-acceptance of the application.

All applications will be reviewed and rated in accordance with the format and review criteria cited in the general instructions. Up to 100 points will be awarded and distributed based on the applicable criteria. It is essential that each evaluative criterion be addressed.

Appendix B - Rubric for 2003-2004 Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality

A. Need

10 Points

Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive	Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>lacks a description of the specific needs or problems to be addressed including student learning needs and the professional development needs of the staff; and</p> <p>makes no connection between proposed professional development and scientifically based research; and</p> <p>includes no evidence that each participating district meets the high need category by showing a 20% or higher poverty rate and a number of teachers who are not adequately prepared to teach the content proposed for this project; and</p> <p>not <u>applicable</u></p> <p>Category E Does not refer to prior learning in any substantial way.</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>describes the needs or problems with minimal definition or clarity and provides minimal link between student learning needs and the need for professional development; and</p> <p>includes a weak connection between the proposed professional development and scientifically-based research or to research that is not scientifically-based; and</p> <p>contains vague reference to prior strategies to address the need, <u>if applicable</u></p> <p>Category E Refers to prior learning in vague terms without giving evidence.</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>clearly describes the needs or problems along with supporting evidence and provides a vague link between student learning needs and professional development needs of staff; and</p> <p>includes an unsubstantiated reference to scientifically-based research (or, at a minimum, theory research) about the proposed professional development; and</p> <p>provides evidence that demonstrates that each of the partner school(s) fits into the high need category by showing a 20% or higher poverty rate and a number of teachers who are not adequately prepared to teach the content proposed for this project; and</p> <p>contains a clear reference to prior strategies to address the need, <u>if applicable</u></p> <p>Category E – Provides evidence of participant learning at the conclusion of the prior learning experience.</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>describes need(s) /problem(s) to be addressed including the link between student learning needs and the professional development needs of staff and provides appropriate evidence; and</p> <p>includes a description of the scientifically-based research (or, at a minimum, theory research) which influenced the proposed response to the identified need(s) and includes the source of the research; and</p> <p>Provides evidence that demonstrates that the partner school(s) fit into the high need category as well as identified by Education YES as most in need of assistance or a school identified as not meeting AYP.</p> <p>describes actions taken previously by the applicant(s) and/or other entities to address the need, <u>if applicable</u></p> <p>Category E- Provides clear, convincing evidence that the project under category E is based on summative data of prior learning.</p>

45 Points				
B. Plan of Operation				
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive	Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal: has no evidence of short-term and/or long-term goals for the proposed professional development; and	The Proposal: lacks clarity or rigor of proposed short-term goals; goals not aligned to stated needs for professional development; and	The Proposal: has both proposed short-term and long-term goals which clearly address the needs of teacher and/or principals for professional development; and	The Proposal: presents both detailed short-term and long-term goals of the project and the expected results that support student achievement as an outcome of professional development and how attainment will be measured; and	
has no implementation plan and/or does not address required components; and	incomplete and/or unclear implementation plan that addresses some of the required components; and	includes a clear and detailed implementation plan that addresses a portion of the required components; and	includes a clear and detailed implementation plan that addresses all the required components (See pages 10-11 of application packet); and	
provides no assurance that the use of Michigan Curriculum Framework standards for content, teaching and learning, assessment and professional development and the use of MI-CiIMB curriculum tool and/or the NSDC Staff Development Standards; and			assures the use of Michigan Curriculum Framework standards for content, teaching and learning, assessment and professional development and the use of MI-CiIMB curriculum tool, grade-level benchmarks and/or the NSDC Staff Development Standards; and	
			Uses State Board of Education – approved teacher preparation standards in relevant disciplines; and	
there is no plan to assure/encourage that instructors/instructional faculty will model appropriate teaching behaviors and methods; and	Includes a plan that provides limited assurance that instructors/instructional faculty will model appropriate teaching behaviors and methods; and	includes a plan that provides limited assurance that instructors/instructional faculty will model exemplary teaching behaviors and methods; and	includes a plan to assure that instructors/instructional faculty will model exemplary teaching behaviors and methods; and	
the operation plan lacks clarity in the proposed objectives, strategies, benchmarks and a time line of activity; and	Provides an operation plan that is not fully developed to include clearly stated objectives, strategies, benchmarks and a time line of activity; and	provides an operation plan that clearly states the objectives, strategies, benchmarks to assess progress, and a time line of activity; and	includes an activity plan with proposed objectives, key activities to accomplish the objectives with benchmarks to determine progress toward objectives; a time line; and a plan for disseminating information about the project outcomes; and	

B. Plan of Operation continued

Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive	Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
includes an operation plan that does not describe the method for administering the grant nor the identity of responsible staff; and	describes an operation plan with limited information on the administration of the grant or the roles of responsible staff; and	describes a plan for administration of the grant and identifies the responsibilities of staff; and	describes a plan for effective administration of the project with responsibilities identified for each staff person; and
contains no plan for the continued involvement of appropriate groups; and	includes a plan in which members of some groups are initially involved in the design of the project; and	includes a plan for the continued involvement of some appropriate groups in the project; and	includes a plan for the continued involvement of appropriate groups in the project, including but not limited to local boards, as well as teacher and/or principals and administrators, mathematics, science and/or other resource centers, public museums, libraries, and business and industry; and

C. Evaluation Plan**15 Points**

Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive	Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>does not provide a feasible outline of the proposed activities and monitoring plan; and</p> <p>does not include a plan to collect data;</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>provides a brief outline of proposed evaluation activities and a undeveloped plan for their completion; and</p> <p>includes a plan to collect data about numbers of project participants and hours/days of professional development; and</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>provides a clear description of the evaluation plan as well as a plan to monitor objectives, strategies, benchmarks, and timelines; and</p> <p>includes a plan to collect summative and formative data about numbers and characteristics of the project participants and effected personnel; and</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>provides an extensive description of clear and precise objectives, indicators and evaluation activities such as data collection, analysis, reporting methods, expected time line and who is responsible for the activities; and</p> <p>includes a plan to collect summative and formative data about the numbers and characteristics of the project participants, other effected personnel and the effected students to determine impact of the professional development; and</p>

C. Evaluation Plan continued

includes no plan to collect data in follow-up classroom observations of a credible and appropriate sample of teacher and/or principals participating in the professional development; and	includes a limited plan to collect data through follow-up observation of a sample of participating teacher and/or principals; and	includes a plan to collect data through classroom observation of participating teacher and/or principals to measure the effects of the proposed professional development; and	includes a plan to collect data through classroom observation that will measure the changes in teacher and/or principal practice and student learning levels linked to the proposed professional development; and
includes no timeline or details for measuring progress toward project goals; and	includes an undeveloped timeline for determining progress toward the accomplishment of project objectives; and	includes a timeline and details for determining progress toward the accomplishment of project objectives; and	Includes a timeline and details for determining progress toward the accomplishment of objectives related to professional development and systemic reform; and

D. Under-Represented Student Access 5 Points

Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive	Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
The Proposal: does not address the learning needs of teacher and/or principals or the learning needs of their under-represented students to be successful in core academic areas; and	The Proposal: places limited emphasis on the learning needs of under-represented students; and	The Proposal: places special emphasis on the learning needs of all participating teacher and/or principals and their students; and	The Proposal: includes a plan to emphasize instructional designs that address the learning needs of all participating teacher and/or principals and their students and motivates, supports and encourages the achievement of under-represented students in core academic areas; and
does not address the effect of teacher and/or principals' low expectations of and negative attitudes toward culturally different students; and	includes reference to the effect of teacher and/or principals' low expectations culturally different students.	includes activities that address the effect of teacher and/or principals' low expectations of and negative attitudes toward culturally different students.	includes specified activities that address and reduce the effect of teacher and/or principals' low expectations of and negative attitudes toward culturally different students.

E. Budget**10 Points**

Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive	Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
The Proposal: does not provide a detailed budget breakdown defining each participating building/districts costs; and	The Proposal: provides an incomplete budget breakdown of insufficient detail defining each participating building/districts costs; and	The Proposal: provides a clear budget breakdown with detail for each expenditure related to the proposed project including costs per participating teacher and/or principal; and	The Proposal: provides extensive budget breakdown with sufficient detail to show attention to cost effectiveness, is adequate to support the proposed project only and complies with the budget requirements of the REP; and
shows no evidence of a relationship between budget items, project objectives and anticipated results; and	shows occasional relationships between budget items and project objectives; and	shows evidence of relationship between most budget items, project objectives and anticipated results; and	shows evidence of a clear relationship between budget items, project objectives and anticipated results; and
includes un-allowable expenditures; and	includes a mixture of allowable expenditures and those that are not consistent with quality professional development; and	includes only expenditures allowable under the grant guidelines; and	includes only expenditures allowable under the grant guidelines and appropriate in the context of quality professional development; and
			No partner receives more than 50% of total award.

F. Qualification of Key Personnel **5 Points**

Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive	Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>does not address the qualifications and experiences of project director or other key personnel to assure completion of the project.</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>provides marginal evidence of the qualifications and experiences of project director and other key personnel to assure completion of the project.</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>provides evidence that the project director is qualified to assure the completion of the project and attainment of the goals.</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>provides ample evidence of the qualifications of the project director and other key personnel to assure the project achieves all goals and objectives; and</p>
<p>makes no reference to groups that have been traditionally under-represented; and</p>	<p>addresses the need to include more participants who are traditionally under-represented; and</p>	<p>demonstrates that the applicant will consider groups that have been traditionally under-represented in their selection of staff and participants; and</p>	<p>demonstrates that the applicant will give preference to groups that have been traditionally under-represented; and</p>

G. Commitment and Capacity**5 Points**

Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive	Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
The Proposal: contains no description of the extent of which the applicant is essential to the achievement of the objectives; and	The Proposal: contains an unclear or undeveloped reference to the need for this project and this applicant for the achievement of the objectives; and	The Proposal: describes the need for this project administered by this applicant as essential to the achievement of the objectives; and	The Proposal: describes in detail how the applicant is essential to the achievement of the objectives; and
does not discuss the facilitation skills of the project staff to be assigned to working with local schools/districts.	describes only minimal experience facilitating professional development projects for local schools/districts.	describes successful experiences in facilitating professional development projects for local schools/districts' staff.	lists previous successful experiences in facilitating projects associated with professional development partnerships between higher education and schools or school districts; and
does not describe any prior experience providing professional development in the areas of fine arts, mathematics, science or social students; and principals; and	describes only minimal experience providing professional development in fine arts, mathematics, science or social studies; and	describes prior experience in providing professional development in the area of fine arts, mathematics, science or social studies with p-K-12 educators; and	describes extensive and successful prior experiences with pre-K-12 professional development work in the area of fine arts, mathematics, science, or social studies; and

G. Commitment and Capacity continued.

does not demonstrate that the applicant has successfully sustained long-term projects following initial start-up funding; and	demonstrates that the applicant has an appreciation for the need to sustain long-term projects in increase the chance of changing teacher practice; and	demonstrates that the applicant has sustained long-term projects; and	demonstrates that the applicant has successfully sustained long-term projects following initial start-up funding; and
does not include a detailed plan to identify and secure funding sources to continue the project; and	includes an unclear and undeveloped plan for continuing the project following the conclusion of the federal assistance; and	includes a plan for continuing the project following the conclusion of the federal assistance; and	includes a detailed plan to identify and secure funding sources to continue the project following the conclusion of the federal assistance; and
does not demonstrate that sufficient time will be allocated to assure the project achieves all goals and objectives; and	demonstrates an unclear and undeveloped allocation of to assure the project achieves all goals and objectives; and	demonstrates an awareness of the need for time and refers to what staff will be assigned to work on behalf of the project goals and objectives; and	demonstrates that sufficient percentage of time is dedicated to assure the project achieves all goals and objectives; and

H. Summary

5 Points

Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive	Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
The Proposal: does not indicate a commitment to achieving the national and state goals for improving teacher and/or principal quality that increases student learning based on the stated needs and priorities; and	The Proposal: indicates an unclear connection between achieving the national and state goals, improving teacher and/or principal quality and increasing student learning based on the stated needs and priorities; and	The Proposal: indicates a commitment to achieving national and state goals for improving teacher and/or principal quality; and	The Proposal: indicates a commitment to achieving the national and state goals for improving teacher and/or principal quality that increases student learning based on the stated needs and priorities; and
describes a project which has no value for serving as a model for replication and/or statewide dissemination; and	describes a project which could serve as a model for replication and/or statewide dissemination with considerable modifications; and	describes a project which might serve as a model for replication and/or statewide dissemination with a few modifications; and	describes a project which could serve as a model for replication and/or statewide dissemination; and